ARGUMENT

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Twining (US Pat. No. 6,222,449). The Examiner states that Twining teaches Applicants' invention except for disclosing access to an Internet website for receiving information. The Examiner states that Twining discloses downloading data from a network server which inherently may be an internet web site.

Applicants' invention, as now more clearly set forth in independent claims 1, 10 and 18 provides an interactive tool for storing, compiling and analyzing data preferably related to sports. This data may be input manually, automatically from sensor, or downloaded from the Internet. The input data may be time and date stamped, providing automatic linking of all data relevant to that time and date. Alternatively, the input data may be manually linked by the user.

In sharp contrast to the Twining apparatus, Applicants' invention may be linked to the Internet. Applicants respectfully disagree that this aspect of Applicants' invention would have been an obvious element of Twining. Twining specifically refers to and claims a network server, which by definition is limited to those users associated with a dedicated server. In other words, Twining, while having the opportunity to implement an Internet website, did not, implementing a network server device for access by limited users only. As such, Twining is not directed to processing and communicating data via an Internet website as Applicants' novel invention teaches.

Applicants' invention further differs from Twining in the ability to compile images, such as photographs of the fish caught before releasing, the location, the weather, etc. and linking those images with all relevant data, including time and date stamping the images to automatically corresponds to data input at the respective date and time.

Applicants have reviewed the additional art considered by the Examiner and neither Hill nor Branham et al. teaches or suggests Applicants' novel invention. In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.